APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,811	04/21/2004	Mairead Lyons	56011-3	7263

7590   02/02/2010

Brian L. Michaelis
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Two Seaport Lane
Suite 300
Boston, MA 02210-2028

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/828,811	LYONS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 November 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>22-27,30-37 and 40</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>22-27, 30-37 and 40</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20100128

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 11 November 2009.

2.   Claims 22-27, 30-37 and 40 are currently pending and claims 1-21, 28, 29, 38

and 39 have been canceled. In the Amendment filed 11 November 2009, claims 22, 23

and 33 have been amended. This action is made Final.

3.   The rejections of claims 22, 23, 28 and 29 as being unpatentable over US

PGPub 2004/0167823 to Nelly and et in view of US Patent No 7,370,014 to Vasavada

et al in view of US PGPub 2004/0117776 to Pazandek and claims 24-27, 30 and 31 as

being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0167823 to Nelly and et in view of US Patent

No 7,370,014 to Vasavada et al in view of US PGPub 2004/0117776 to Pazandek and

further in view of US PGPub 2002/0147622 to Drolet et al have been withdrawn as

necessitated by Amendment.

Claim Objections

4.   The objections to the claims 22, 23, 28, 29, 33, 38 and 39 are withdrawn as

necessitated by Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US PGPub 2004/0167823 to Nelly and et (hereafter Neely) in view of US

PGPub 2008/0319808 to Wofford et al (hereafter Wofford) in view of US PGPub

2005/0246269 to Smith (hereafter Smith).

        Referring to claim 22, Neely discloses a computer system including at least one

processor and memory, for processing expense information, the system comprising:

        a generic file parser adapted to receive said expense information [data is parsed]

(see [0073], lines 1-3), wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of

formats [.xml file, .edi file, text delimited, web form] (see [0016], lines 1-4), said expense

information including invoice information and transaction information [billing data] (see

[0012] and [0034]);

        an invoice processing module adapted to receive said expense information and

process said invoice information for invoicing [control system 62 coordinates the

generation of the electronic invoice containing billing information] (see [0028] and

[0048]); and

a balance processing module adapted to receive said expense information and
process said transaction information for specific accounts (see [0058]-[0066] and
[0077]).

Neely fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the expense information
being received from a plurality of expense data providers, the generic file parser
configured to output data in a common format or a specific parsing module and an
extension to the specific parsing module. Wofford discloses a generic file parser [the
parser takes any incoming file type] configured to receive said expense information from
a plurality of expense data providers [data feeds from multiple systems], wherein said
expense information includes data in a plurality of formats [any electronic format
available today], said expense information including invoice information and transaction
information, said transaction generic file parser configured to output data in a common
format [parsed into a new standard data protocol formatted in XML] (see [0128]; [0131];
[0172]; and [0173]).

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to collect data disclosed by Nelly from a plurality of providers, parse the data
and then output the data in a common format in the manner as disclosed by Wofford.
One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the efficiency of the
system for the user by providing a system for real time integrating, organizing, analyzing
and displaying of corporate card data from a plurality of providers (Wofford: see [0011]).

While the combination of Neely and Wofford (hereafter Neely/Wofford) discloses
a generic file parser, Neely/Wofford fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of at

least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of

formats, the specific parsing module(s) being configured to overwrite functions of the

generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats

corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules and said specific parsing

module including at least one extension of said generic file parser, the at least one

extension being configured to process specific fields of said expense information. Smith

discloses parsing a file (see abstract), including the further limitations of at least one

specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the

specific parsing module(s) being configured to overwrite functions of the generic file

parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the

respective specific parsing modules and said specific parsing module including at least

one extension of said generic file parser, the at least one extension being configured to

process specific fields of said expense information [the file importer provides a

pluggable architecture in that it can be extended to support additional file types,

including proprietary file types; allow for the inclusion of additional information] (see

[0062]; [0066]-[0068]; [0085]; and [0100]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the specific parsing modules disclosed by Smith with the general

parser of Neely/Wofford. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a

way in which to handle customized data (Smith: see [0012] and [0014]).

Referring to claim 23, the combination of Neely/Wofford and Smith (hereafter

Neely/Wofford/Smith) discloses the computer system of claim 22, wherein the generic

file parser is adapted to process said expense information that is received in a generic

format; and wherein said specific fields that are processed by said extensions do not

agree with the generic format information [the file importer provides a pluggable

architecture in that it can be extended to support additional file types, including

proprietary file types; allow for the inclusion of additional information] (Smith: see [0062];

[0066]-[0068]; [0085]; and [0100]).

7.   **Claims 24-27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0167823 to Nelly and et in view of US PGPub

2008/0319808 to Wofford et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0246269 to Smith, as

applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2002/0147622 to

Drolet et al (hereafter Drolet).

        Referring to claim 24, Neely/Wofford/Smith discloses the computer system of

claim 22, further comprising: an incoming data receiving component [application 107], to

connect to a source of data and receive incoming data (Neely: see [0073], lines 1-3);

and a loader component, in communication with said generic parsing module, to receive

parsed data from said generic parsing module [application component loads data into a

relational database] (Neely: see [0073]). Neely/Wofford/Smith fails to explicitly disclose

the further limitations of the loader component to sort said parsed data into a plurality of

temporary tables as a function of said plurality of fields; and a data sorting component,

in communication with said plurality of temporary tables and with said database, to

access sorted data in said plurality of temporary tables, and to re-sort said sorted data

into a plurality of tables in said database. Drolet discloses the loader component to sort said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging database 150] as a function of said plurality of fields (see [0044]); and a data sorting component, in communication with said plurality of temporary tables and with said database, to access sorted data in said plurality of temporary tables, and to re-sort said sorted data into a plurality of tables in said database [alert database] (see [0044]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to staging tables of Drolet with the process of Neely/Wofford/Smith. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a way to pre-process and reformat the data before inserting the data into the database.

Referring to claim 25, the combination of Neely/Wofford/Smith and Drolet (hereafter Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet) discloses the computer system of claim 24 wherein said loader component-processes said parsed data into a proper format for insertion into said database and stores said parsed data in a file; said loader component being further configured to deactivate access to a temporary table in said database and load said file into said temporary table in said database and thereafter re-activate access to said temporary table (Drolet: see [0063] and [0075]).

Referring to claim 26, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the computer system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component also inserts relational link information in said plurality of tables in said database [relational database 109] (Neely: see [0073]).

   Referring to claim 27, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the computer
system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component, upon accessing a data item in
said temporary tables that indicates an error, moves said data item into a corresponding
error table (Drolet: see [0111]).

   Referring to claim 30, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the computer
system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component processes data in a form of at
least one of transaction data, line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg
data, and card balance data (Wofford: see [0136]).

   Referring to claim 31, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the computer
system of claim 24 wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions
completed using a commercial credit card (Wofford: see [0136]).

8.   **Claims 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US
PGPub 2004/0167823 to Nelly and et in view of US PGPub 2008/0319808 to
Wofford et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0246269 to Smith in view of US PGPub
2002/0147622 to Drolet et al as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of
US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood (hereafter Underwood).**

   Referring to claims 32, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet fails to explicitly disclose the
further limitation of said data sorting component includes additional information in said
data tables regarding tax information for said transactional data. Underwood discloses
initializing an ecommerce database framework, wherein said data is transactional data
representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card (see column 107,

lines 56-61) including the further limitation wherein said data sorting component

includes additional information in said data tables regarding tax information for said

transactional data (Underwood: see column 116, lines 7-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the feature of Underwood with the tables of

Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet. One would have been motivated to do so since it is well-

known that credit card transactions include tax information.

9. **Claims 33-37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0167823 to Nelly et al in view of US PGPub

2008/0319808 to Wofford et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0246269 to Smith in view

of US PGPub 2002/0147622 to Drolet et al.

Referring to claim 33, Neely discloses a method for processing expense

information comprising:

Providing a generic file parser adapted to receive said expense information [data

is parsed] (see [0073], lines 1-3), wherein said expense information includes data in a

plurality of formats [.xml file, .edi file, text delimited, web form] (see [0016], lines 1-4),

said expense information including invoice information and transaction information

[billing data] (see [0012] and [0034]);

providing an invoice processing module adapted to receive said expense

information and process said invoice information for invoicing [control system 62

coordinates the generation of the electronic invoice containing billing information] (see [0028] and [0048]); and

     providing a balance processing module adapted to receive said expense information and process said transaction information for specific accounts (see [0058]-[0066] and [0077]).

     Neely fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the expense information being received from a plurality of expense data providers, the generic file parser configured to output data in a common format or a specific parsing module and an extension to the specific parsing module. Wofford discloses a generic file parser [the parser takes any incoming file type] configured to receive said expense information from a plurality of expense data providers [data feeds from multiple systems], wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of formats [any electronic format available today], said expense information including invoice information and transaction information, said transaction generic file parser configured to output data in a common format [parsed into a new standard data protocol formatted in XML] (see [0128]; [0131]; [0172]; and [0173]).

     It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to collect data disclosed by Nelly from a plurality of providers, parse the data and then output the data in a common format in the manner as disclosed by Wofford. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the efficiency of the system for the user by providing a system for real time integrating, organizing, analyzing and displaying of corporate card data from a plurality of providers (Wofford: see [0011]).

While the combination of Neely and Wofford (hereafter Neely/Wofford) discloses a generic file parser, Neely/Wofford fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of providing at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being configured to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules and said specific parsing module including at least one extension of said generic file parser, the at least one extension being configured to process specific fields of said expense information. Smith discloses parsing a file (see abstract), including the further limitations of providing at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being configured to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules and said specific parsing module including at least one extension of said generic file parser, the at least one extension being configured to process specific fields of said expense information [the file importer provides a pluggable architecture in that it can be extended to support additional file types, including proprietary file types; allow for the inclusion of additional information] (see [0062]; [0066]-[0068]; [0085]; and [0100]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the specific parsing modules disclosed by Smith with the general parser of Neely/Wofford. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a way in which to handle customized data (Smith: see [0012] and [0014]).

Neely/Wofford/Smith fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the sorting said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables, said sorting being a function of said plurality of fields, to form sorted data; and to re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into a plurality of tables in a database. Drolet discloses sorting said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging database 150], said sorting being a function of said plurality of fields, to form sorted data (see [0044]); and re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into a plurality of tables in a database [alert database] (see [0044]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to staging tables of Drolet with the process of Neely/Wofford/Smith. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a way to pre-process and reformat the data before inserting the data into the database.

Referring to claim 34, Neely/Wofford/Smith discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said step of sorting said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables includes: processing said data into a proper format for insertion as formatted data into a database; storing said formatted data in a file; deactivating access to a temporary table in said database; loading said formatted data from said file into said temporary table in said database; and re-activating access to said data table (Drolet: see [0063] and [0075]).

Referring to claim 35, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the method of claim 33 further including: during said step of inserting said sorted data into tables in said database, inserting relational link information to other tables in said database [relational database 109] (Neely: see [0073]).

Referring to claim 36, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said step of re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in said database includes: if a data item indicates an error, moving said data item into a corresponding error table in said database (Drolet: see [0111]).

Referring to claim 37, Neely/Wofford/Smith/Drolet discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said data is credit card transaction data (Wofford: see [0136]).

Referring to claim 40, Neely/Vasavada/Pazandek/Drolet discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said step of re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in said database includes processing said sorted data in terms of one of transaction data, line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg data, and card balance data (Wofford: see [0136]).

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the newly added amendments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11.   Applicant's arguments on page 16 of the Remarks in regards to the use of Drolet to teach the limitation of "sorting said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables, … resorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in a database" have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The step of inserting the data into the staging tables is considered to be analogous to the step of sorting, since the data has to be sorted in order to be entered into a table.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure.

- US Patent No 6,044,362 to Neely titled "Electronic Invoicing and Payment
  System"

- US PGPub 2001/0023414 to Kumar et al titled "Interactive Calculation and
  Presentation of Financial Data Results through a Single Interface on a Data-
  Packet-Network

- US PGPub 2003/0171992 to Blagg et al

- US Patent No 7,490,059 to Albee et al

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP
§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37
CFR 1.136(a).

       A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/   /Kimberly Lovel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167   Examiner
                                                      Art Unit 2167

28 January 2010
/KL/